

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 1, 1973

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this evening I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 26 members of the 12th Cub Pack under the direction of Mr. Hamerling, Mrs. V. Howie, Mr. W. Shoat. This cub pack is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works. On behalf of the members of the Assembly I bid you welcome.

Resolution 107. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

SUPPLY - TOURISM, RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a few words to the Estimates of the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Recreation.

Firstly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be critical as I was in the past of the importance that has been attached to that particular department, and by importance, Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could be more specific and suggest that the kind of allocation that is being made to that particular department is very much less than would be reasonable to expect.

I think it would be true to say, Mr. Chairman, that the present allocation of \$10 million is in proportion, probably less in proportion or in relation to the rest of the budget, less than the Department of Recreation and Cultural Affairs has ever received in the last ten years. We live in a time when we are told periodically that the people of Manitoba will be more and more confronted with the problems of extending their leisure time with enjoyment, and at the same time we see the government withdrawing the kind of money, the kind of allocation that that kind of a department deserves and would bring to the betterment of those who would like to enjoy their leisure time as much as possible.

I would also like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that like I did last year, I feel that the Minister has taken the task of administering that department with seriousness, has brought some stability to the Cabinet, and consequently I have no criticism to launch in his direction in terms of administration.

It'll be no surprise to my honourable friends, both sides of the House, that I don't wish to be associated at all with the remarks that have been made by my colleague and friend from Charleswood last night. I realize that his information might well be valuable or valid; I have no doubt that he spoke what he thought, but I have equally no doubts in suggesting that his thoughts and mine in that particular subject area are somewhat different.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to address myself as well to some projects in the Emerson constituency. I'm not sure whether it is futile to speak of potential development but at least I feel it is my responsibility to make the Minister aware that the constituency of Emerson certainly has potential, certainly has promising areas of development affecting his particular department, and I can only regret that the funds that should be allocated, and should be expended, in that area are certainly hard to come by. To be a little more specific, I'm sure that the Minister of Recreation has heard of Butcher Hill. Butcher Hill is a potential development in the Piney region which would require some minor amount of development, if you talk about comparing this to provincial expenditures, and yet the Minister has been required by his financial arrangements to write back to the people who would eagerly await this kind of development and tell them, I am sorry there is really no money available for that kind of development at present. I think that is a sad commentary, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to blame the government directly for that because I think their allocation is wrong.

There is another project that I think is very worthwhile considering, and it might be a bit strange that I bring this up in these particular estimates but I look at this as a service to tourists as well as Manitobans. There has been some suggestion made to the Minister of Industry and Commerce that a landing strip be provided at the International Boundary line at Emerson. I feel that that kind of customs clearing facility will eventually be brought about. I think it's an unrealistic inconvenience to expect the people using pleasure aircrafts to have to land in Pembina or Winnipeg regardless of where they're going in order to have custom clearance.

I remind the Minister as well that the custom clearance that is done in Pembina is done on the goodwill, by the goodwill of the customs officers, because there is no regulations that

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . . compel them in any way to accommodate anyone who wishes to be inspected for border crossing at Pembina. We might well find ourselves inconveniencing people beyond reality if we don't look into the matter of providing this kind of facility.

One very popular recreation area for the people of Winnipeg, of course, is the lake at St. Malo. I was requesting of the Minister I believe last year, or two years ago, that we increase the number of the electrified parking lanes in that particular area, and the then Minister, who is now Minister of Highways, accommodated us by increasing by one bay the electrification. We have a request that another bay should be electrified, and I would like to point out as well that we are not thinking of going beyond that; the people of the park area and those involved in the administration make that request as being that it should be done and we should not have to expect further electrification unless there's expansion to the parking lot itself.

Probably one of the most beautiful areas in Manitoba that is yet undeveloped, frequently thought of, frequently mentioned, but remains totally unused in terms of its potential, is the Lake of the Woods, more specifically Buffalo Point. The Minister might be well aware that some major developments were at one time being planned for Buffalo Point but did not materialize for a number of reasons; but I say that there is no better time than now to consider that area seriously as a potential recreational area.

Why now? The Member for St. Johns says, why now? I would like to point out to him that every year there is an increasing demand for recreational facilities in the province, an increasing demand because if the standard of living is increasing, if the leisure time is increasing, it is not unusual for us to expect that the demand for this kind of facility will also be increasing. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if my Honourable Friend from St. Johns wishes to dabble in political things of the nature of buoyant economies and so on, I might lose him because I tend to want to stay on this subject and to be as straightforward as I can.

I would like to point out to the Minister of Tourism that — he probably is well aware that the RCMP is celebrating their 100th anniversary this year, and a number of celebrations have been organized for that time. I'd like to emphasize and advertise possibly that the Musical Ride will be coming to Emerson on August 2nd, and the people of Emerson are eagerly organizing, with enthusiasm I must add, the celebrations of that particular day. I would hope that you will find it of interest to you whether it be just before or just after the election campaign that you visit that area on that occasion, and I assure you you will have no regrets.

I would like to also talk a bit about the grants that were made available through the Minister's department, and I'm referring now to the capital grants produced, whereby the money came from I understand the Lotteries Commission. I would like to point out that, as I have been suggesting many times, that one of the weaknesses in our make work programs is the fact that we don't include any money for capital expenditures and what happens as a consequence, what happens as a consequence is that communities that have the financial base that enables them to provide capital money for the projects that labour is paying for by LIP or by PEP can well make meaningful use of this kind of grant. However, communities that have much less financial base are not able to do so. The grant that was made available through Cultural Affairs enabled some communities to make very real and very important developments to their particular areas, and I speak now especially of the area of Sprague and the area of St. Malo where significant changes have been made in their recreational life by addition of skating rinks, or artificial ice, and so on. I would like to suggest possibly that the idea of capital money being used along with the labour grant should be looked at more seriously and possibly even at the cost, possibly even at the cost of reducing money that is to be allocated for strictly labour purposes should be diverted into some degree possibly to capital expenditures. And I've noticed with interest that the Federal Government has done this in their 1973 LIP program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to single out that probably one very potential and maybe not sufficiently developed area of my constituency which I find very interesting and culturally worthwhile is the Ukrainian Museum that is being developed at Gardenton. I think that too little attention is being paid by the province with regard to that particular museum, and too little financial assistance is granted to that area. I say this because to my knowledge it is the only museum of its kind in Manitoba; it represents the heritage of the second largest ethnic group, or maybe even the largest if we consider ethnic by a particular definition, and I think that we miss the boat if we don't very carefully assess and encourage that particular project.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . .

Mr. Chairman, just in conclusion I would like to reiterate my disappointment in that the Department of Recreation is being flouted by the government through a lack of funds at a time especially when there is an increasing demand and an increasing pressure by people who will be making more and more use of these facilities. I think it is also sometimes regrettable that we aim, that we aim all the developments, if not all at least most of the developments, in regards to recreation for the people of the urban community of Winnipeg. I think that we should consider developing not only for this particular centre but rather for a variety of other centres in the province. I think if we're going to be looking even at servicing Winnipeg, we'll have to be looking to the south, we'll have to be looking to the developments that could take place on the Roseau River which have not been in my view carefully assessed and certainly are potentials. -- (Interjection) --

Well, it just proves my point, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health says where is that, and it just confirms that the government hasn't seriously considered the only river that drains water from close to Lake of the Woods into the Red River; the water route, Mr. Chairman, that has been used by the Minister of Health's forefather, La Verendrye. -- (Interjection) --

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the next budget in the next estimates will reflect a more realistic approach to the Tourism and Recreation Department in Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Please do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 107 was read and passed) Resolution No. 108(a)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (b)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (c)(1) -- the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, breakdown of the two items where the major portions of the money are going

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is asking for a breakdown on there. There's over \$2 million for wages of park maintenance and operation, and you know, what am I going to do. Do you want the name of all the people and what they're being paid or - it's all salaries.

MR. FROESE: No, the heading is park maintenance and operations. I would like to know how much money is spent on the various parks.

MR. ENNS: Just give us the facts, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeah. Well the eastern region is 1 million, 283.9, the western 466.9; northern 201.3, and the head office -- (Interjection) -- be careful -- the head office \$72,000.00. -- (Interjection) --

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside says nothing for Rhineland. Now there is nothing for the south, and it's not only my riding it's the other ridings too that are represented by some of the Conservative members. Yet I ask, get up and ask, and now they ridicule, but I certainly would like to know what . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I understand your area I think is considered in the western region.

MR. FROESE: I looked at the booklet that was tabled by the Minister the other day and I notice from that that the southern portion is included in the western, but certainly members very well know that in southern Manitoba there are very little recreational spots, and we have repeatedly asked for Pembina Dam that would provide some facilities, some location whereby we could have some recreation in southern Manitoba and not have to go to northern Manitoba all the time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well what I give you, Mr. Chairman, is the breakdown of the earnings of the 552 employees, there's 237.5 in the eastern region; 86.9 in the western region; 52.7 northern; and 133 in the head office. 130, members in the head office, and 40.9.

MR. FROESE: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (c)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (c)--passed. (d)(1)--passed; The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): . . . Park development, I fail to see where we can develop many parks with that kind of dollars; maybe the Honourable Minister could explain how the item is . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Some of this information you will be getting in Capital Supply. We're getting quite a bit of money and you'll see that there is more money for development of park in Capital Supply when we . . .

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(2)--passed; (d)--passed. The Honourable Member for Osborne,

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, other than the Minister's salary I think this item is the one that - under which I will have to raise once again one of the concerns that I raised the other day. I wouldn't normally have brought this subject matter up again except that at 5:00 o'clock this afternoon I did hear a radio broadcast which seemed to put in more definite terms the administrative opinion and decision of the Department of Tourism with regard to the control of algae on the lakes in provincial parks.

The radio newscast that I heard, and certainly I think it was well founded on what the Minister said the other day, was to the effect that his department rejected the use of copper sulphate for the control of algae on the various lakes. That decision no one can I suppose disagree with, I gather it was made on the basis of some kind of scientific technical evaluation of the extraneous or spillover effects of copper sulphate used on various lakes.

I would like to know who in his department is qualified to make that kind of analysis and decision. If it's not within his department, I would like to know in which department that kind of staff is employed. I would like to know as well what kind of study they undertook to determine whether or not copper sulphate was a better control of algae blooms than some other chemical.

That is my major concern but there is also another one which is really an administrative problem.

It has been pointed out to me before by various people engaged in research in this province, particularly biological research, that there is an area of study within the province that falls between the two departments of Mines and Tourism. I have mentioned this before with regard to analysis of water in which we find dead fish. Apparently there is, I've been told anyway, there has been some attempt on the part of Tourism to get the qualified staff within its own department under a budget allocation so that they could undertake analysis of water which resulted, or which apparently resulted in fish kills, and at the same time it seems that the Department of Mines, either within the line department or in the Clean Environment Line Commission, have that staff and have the budget allocation for that kind of staff.

To get back to the use of copper sulphate, it seems that here too there is some administrative responsibility that has fallen between two stools. The Minister of Tourism is reported as rejecting the use of copper sulphate for the control of algae, and yet I quoted from a letter that I received from the Minister of Mines, which in turn was produced by the Director General of the Water Resources Branch, indicating that copper sulphate could be used. And it was this letter that I was quoting the other day when I raised the subject of algae control on our lakes, and as it seems that there is some problem with just where this information came from in my previous speech I want to quote it, and of course if the members are interested the letter can be tabled.

The Director of Water Control says this that - I'm quoting here. "The excess of algae blooms may be controlled by using various algicides. The cheapest and most commonly used is copper sulphate which may be sprayed over selected areas of the lake in a dry or liquid form." And he goes on: "It was decided that the Water Resources Branch could make available technical assistance to municipalities or organized groups that may wish to carry out algae control programs. I see no reason why the cottage owners around Brereton Lake could not as a group make application to the Parks Branch or the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs for assistance since Brereton Lake is in the Whiteshell Provincial Park. We would under those circumstances provide the necessary technical assistance. I am sure that a supervised algae control program in Brereton Lake would result in a significant reduction in the numbers of algae in the lake."

Now the problem that I raise I am sure is fairly apparent to the Minister and the members. On October 23rd, 1972, that letter was given to me. It contains information which I have just quoted, which I assume is based on technical and scientific data which the Department of Mines has collected. That's the recommendation that I received from the Director of Water Control. It's the recommendation that I naturally conveyed to my constituents who raised this problem with me initially, the problem of algae blooms on Brereton Lake.

And then, a few months later we have the Minister of Tourism standing in his place in the Legislature and saying that he and his department reject the use of copper sulphate.

Well, Sir, you know if the Ministers of the Crown cannot get together on the type of advice that they wish to give me and to my constituents then I think that the administration

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . . of the government may not be as good as certainly I would like to try to make out.

So I leave this then with the Minister. I know that he is — in the past, he has in the past provided quite -- (Interjection) -- quite good answers to the questions that have been raised by the members, and I certainly would like a good answer to this question of apparent administrative contradiction; and certainly I would like to know whether or not copper sulphate is detrimental in its spillover effect or whether in fact it should be used to control algae in the coming season, which is likely going to be a bad one for algae because of the low water levels.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I will just stop there then and wait for the Minister's response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate — it would appear that the honourable member wasn't in his seat. I thought he was when I answered him yesterday because I think he did receive a -- (Interjection) -- oh, I haven't had time to read the front page today. I might say to my honourable friend that at no time did we say that we rejected the use of copper sulphate to treat the algae. This is not what we said at all. I said that the advice that we get -- we would like to have a staff of biologists also but this would be duplication. There is a department that is charged with that, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. We are in touch with their specialists and their biologists and the Environmental Protection Branch and the Public Health specialist also, and the information that we're given, that they're not too sure yet. I think we've had over the period of years — we have the problem with the mercury in the lakes. And my honourable friend also mentioned the dead fish, and we are a little afraid of this and until we know more about it we are using it to a certain extent but we hesitate to recommend the wide use of this copper sulphate.

And I might also like to tell my honourable friend that I think that there is not too much doubt that the algae could be controlled but the price would be, the cost would be prohibitive. This is something that the Province of Manitoba cannot begin to control the algae in all our recreational lakes. We have over 100,000 lakes. They're not all recreational lakes at this time but the problem exists in many places. So what do we do, we do the best the next best thing. We worry about the, more about the planning now. This is something that there seems that there wasn't that much necessity. It was felt that there wasn't that much necessity for planning at the time in previous years, and I'm not faulting anybody on that. And then it might be that we will limit the type of boats, the type of force of motor that will be allowed on certain lakes, and the number of cottages, and so on. And this is exactly what we're trying to do now. We have certain lakes that are over populated, and the lake that my honourable friend mentioned is one of them. Now the algae doesn't necessarily come just by low water. There are other factors, as I said yesterday, such as the sunlight exposure, the warm weather, and whatever you find in the water.

So I recognize — I can't give my honourable friend a better answer than that. We are concerned with the copper sulphate. It's being used in different places in the United States and Canada. The biologists are keeping track of that, they're keeping us informed. For the moment we're not restricting it; we are saying go easy on it until we know a little more. We don't want another mercury problem; and I say to my honourable friend that the cost to treat all the lakes, the recreational lakes, the way my friend would like to see it, it would be prohibitive. In fact it would be impossible to start doing it in a province with a population of 1 million people. The Health Unit people are careful that the quality of the water -- I notice my honourable friend brought me a sample and I must admit it didn't look too good. Some of my senior personnel and myself we went over to Brereton Lake; we looked the situation over; we contacted the biologist also of the department, and we asked them to make sure to analyze that and they told us there was no danger. So this is about all I can tell my honourable friend at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d)(2)--passed; The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I'm sorry that I missed the Minister's Salary the last — I think that's somewhat passed, is it? Well I'll wait till concurrence. Right now I'd like to ask the Minister, what development has taken place in the last number of years on the development of Oak Lake and Metigoshe Lakes, and particularly on Oak Lake I'm asking him the question on what is done to stabilize the shoreline in Oak Lake, and that is in the provincial park area that is now owned by the province. And I refer to Lake Metigoshe, I'd like him to make some comments

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . . on what has been done in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring one matter to the attention of the Minister in this particular clause, and that is the wayside park at Kergwenon which is about halfway between Ste. Rose and McCreary. That's a very popular wayside park. It was very very small; there were hardly any facilities there previous to this year, but there was always one or two cars there stopped, any time you went by there was always cars there. There was no water facilities; anybody that wanted water had to go to a neighbouring farm or something. There was no garbage facilities to speak of, and last year I made some representations to the Minister, the then Minister of Tourism, to the Honourable Peter Burtniak, and we had 33 acres of land there that the province owned and upon my recommendations we enlarged the wayside park where it's now suitable, but at that time we suggested that it sits right on the 51st parallel, and I had suggested that perhaps we should put a cairn there designating the 51st parallel. It may be of some interest to people to get them to stop at that park. I was under the impression that the cairn was already prepared and ready for installation this spring. I would like to know just what happened to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . my honourable friend from Ste. Rose, I would say that this wayside park is being rebuilt under the auspices of the Winter Works Program. A new washroom will be built also, and a parking area and the picnic area will be enlarged. That should be going on this summer.

Now my honourable friend — the Oak Lake, this is a place where we have no responsibility for the shoreline erosion whenever the area is outside our designated boundaries, designated outside the park within the Oak Lake property the shorelines have been repaired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(2)--passed; (e)(1)--passed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned this earlier in the day when I spoke and I didn't get a reply from the Minister. I just wonder how does the FRED program tie in with the Department of Tourism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend must have been absent because he did get a -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, you got a -- I said that everything -- maybe I didn't follow, maybe I called it after, that's right. But the FRED Program, I think this'll be going about the same amount until 1977 when this is finished and the only thing left is in Hecla Island. This is all in Hecla Island.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 108 was read and passed.)

Resolution 109(a)--passed; (b)--passed, (c)--passed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on (c) Tourist Promotion. How much are we spending on billboards? I noticed when I came, when I went to Minneapolis and coming back, I noticed several of Manitoba signs, "Visit Friendly Manitoba," and I would like to know how much of the money is being spent on billboards, and how much of that is spent in the United States?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: While we're trying to find this information, Mr. Chairman, I might say that most of our tourist promotion is spent and either there's more in the radio now and then in different magazines. Now you're probably talking about what we're doing between here and Minneapolis and just south of us. There is quite a bit of promotion in malls in different cities, and I think this would be part of this promotion in the malls. We'll see if we can get this information for my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 109 was read and passed.)

Resolution 110(a) -- The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate the level of support that will be granted to the Manitoba Sports Federation through his department this year. There's no breakout for grants in Resolution 110, but this group has been doing a pretty effective job with junior sports in the province, and I wonder if he could indicate what size of grant, or if any, they are going to be giving to the Sports Federation. And also could he indicate what the long-term development of junior sports in Manitoba, what pattern

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . it might take, whether the government is going to see fit to support the likes of the Sports Federation body or whether they intend to develop a branch, more extensive branch of activities in his own department under this, or any other details he could provide.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I covered that — I thought I covered that quite thoroughly this afternoon. I will not go into the same details as I did. I'm sure that my honourable friend could speak with some of his friends or read Hansard. But I might say that so far the Sports Federation has received \$25,000.00. This was the first time and this was a grant for administration. Right now there is a study being made with the Sports Federation, with other groups, to look at, to try to pinpoint, or try and arrive at the role of the Sports Federation. Now while we're studying this we still are trying to co-operate with the Sports Federation. We have made some interim grants to the sports bodies directly, the sports association, sports bodies directly. There was \$33,000 that was announced Friday. I repeated this this — I gave details this afternoon. This would be to a maximum of \$2,000 (previously it was \$500 maximum) now there is, and I repeat again this is an interim grant. This is money from the — it won't be in here, this is the wrong place. It's money coming in from the lotteries revenue, and as I say when we are ready to announce the long-range planning we will do so. In the meantime we are staying, as I say we made a \$25,000 grant to the Sports Federation to help them in administration. This was this year, and we have made some grants directly to the sports bodies, but I hope that we will have more to announce on that in the not too distant future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 110 was read and passed.)

Resolution 111(a) -- The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Thompson isn't here tonight, and I don't intend to take up his battle on this particular department, but I would like to ask the Minister if after the year that has passed with the Manitoba Film Classification Board operation, has it proved successful over the old Censor Board which represented the people of Manitoba on what movies were shown? Now in the year that has passed we've seen some strange developments in Winnipeg. The opening of massage parlours at \$16.00 or \$20.00 for the first half hour, and then another \$15.00 if you wished to stay and I don't know exactly what goes on. I do not speak from experience but I have had more than one friend from out of province say to me that Winnipeg has become the pornographic capital of Canada. And while this relates to the next section, cultural development, I think it can be properly discussed under the item 111, namely the Manitoba Film Classification Board.

It was about a month ago that there was a two page spread in the Tribune telling about the flesh-pots of Winnipeg and what was available to anybody who wished to avail themselves of the services here. And I would wonder if the Minister could give us a report on if he's satisfied with the operation of the Manitoba Film Classification Board; if he's satisfied with the cultural development that's taking place in the province in this respect, and how many, I would like to know, how many prosecutions have been carried out with respect to the showing of pornographic movies in the Province of Manitoba; how many citizens have complained about what they do not like, and in each case I would like to know what action the government has taken in this regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Just before the Minister replies, I wonder if he could also give us the names of the people that are serving on the Film Classification Board and whether it's still the practice that only two or three members will view a certain film and pass on it. It's just a portion of the board that looks after the things from time to time. It may not be the same ones every time. At least this was the practice up until a year ago and maybe this has changed. I would certainly like to know.

I think what the Member for Portage stated in connection with these massage parlours, and certainly every morning when we eat breakfast at the St. Regis Hotel we get a place mat and that's where the advertisements appear, not only one but there's two on the sheet every morning, and I don't know how many people avail themselves of that, or how many patronize those places, but maybe the Minister can tell us something about it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. DESJARDINS: To elaborate a little more, I don't know what's the matter with a massage. I never heard that there's anything wrong with a massage.

I might say to my honourable friends that let's not blame everything on the Classification Board or the change here, because the massage parlours have nothing to do with that, and it's nothing to do with this department. They have to be licensed by the city and I think the morality squad would look after that. You know I can't say that this relaxation or this change from the censorship to Classification Board has anything to do with it. I must say that I ignore that, I didn't know that there were massage parlours of the type that I suspect my honourable friend means in Winnipeg.

Now as far as the classification. If my friends want an opinion, I suppose that nobody's ever satisfied with classification or censorship unless they do the censoring themselves, and I think that this change from censorship to classification has enabled us to do exactly that. I am very pleased with the board, with the makeup of the board and the chairman of the board. I think that they are very very interested people. We've changed the setup now for my honourable friend from Rhineland. At least three of them view every film. It used to be two before and now it's three, and if there is any doubt at all they call more people in; if there is any doubt they call more people in and the chairman and the vice-chairman themselves will view those particular films. I must say that I'm very very pleased that at least we're giving the information to the public, and after all this is some things that the parents must do, and the individual must do himself. If he's told, if the parents are given the information this is a film that's restricted adult, there's too much sex, too much violence, they must carry on part of this responsibility; they must accept part of this responsibility. One thing that surprised me, it's a pleasant surprise, is the co-operation that we've had from the industry. They've been — I think that so far it's working. I've been keeping my fingers out of there. If there is some thing that the board feels could be prosecuted under the Criminal Code, they unofficially, on their own, they will talk to their friends in the industry, and most of the time that film will not be shown. We've had very few complaints, and as soon as there are complaints — we've had very few minors. This is one thing that all the minors before were going to the movies. Now we have these restriction of parental guidance, and we have a restricted and restricted adult. Restricted adult, as you know, no one under 18 years old can go under any circumstances, and I think this is an improvement. And we're inspecting that. We've heard a few complaints. We've checked as much as we can and we haven't been able to detect anybody under the age of 18 in some of those movies.

Now besides that there is no doubt that -- maybe this is something, some responsibility that I'm taking upon myself -- but if I get a report from the Chairman of the Board that a film should not be shown, I immediately tell the Attorney-General who would have — it's true we can't cut, it's classification, we can't censor, but the Attorney-General would have somebody there and if it is, if in their opinion it contravenes the Criminal Code, well then the film would be seized immediately and they would be prosecuted. At least we stand a chance. The Criminal Code is the same, if you remember when we had the classification, the Censorship Board, when the Stewardess came in before it was cut the board let it go and then the Attorney-General prosecuted, and what were we told by the Judge, well you have a board that let it go, you accept the responsibility, and nothing was done. I don't think that Winnipeg is — I'm not happy with everything that I see in Winnipeg, and I don't think any of us are, but this is the changing time. We are going through a rough period, this generation is, there's been so much change but I think that eventually the people will be better informed; the people are policing themselves much more. It is true that was pointed out by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources last year, that when something is not forbidden the people tire of those things very fast. I've seen sex shops in Europe, and so on. There's nobody there except a few tourists, and these places are dying now. At one time it was the thing, now it's at every corner the people don't pay any attention to it. We recognize we are going through a difficult period but I think that the people will start using their own judgment, and I think that after these difficult years the people will be better behaved and will discipline themselves better than they have in the past. I think that they are maturing. This is something that we can't shelter everybody forever, especially in this time and day and age, and this — at least we're getting the best co-operation from the industry and as I say, I'm very pleased with the work of the Classification Board. I shouldn't single out anybody but

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . especially I think I'd have to single out the chairman who's probably the most qualified, if there's such a thing as qualified in films, the most qualified person in Canada. He teaches a film at St. Paul's College and then in the summer he's in much demand to teach film to the adults in Toronto, so this is about all I can say at this time. So far I'm keeping my fingers crossed. There hasn't been any abuse and the co-operation between everybody has been very good.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, just a matter of clarification. Did I understand the Minister to say that there were very few complaints and also that there were no prosecutions in the past year?

MR. DESJARDINS: I've a report on this and maybe if my friend is interested, maybe I'll read the whole thing. I think it's worth it after a year of changes. It's only a page and a half. I would like to -- this was prepared to -- I intend to table this and there was no request for that and I thought we'd deal with it at Estimate time. So I'll read it the way it is if you allow me.

I'd like to table the Annual Report for 1972/73 of the Manitoba Film Classification Board. While there is no statutory requirement that this be done, the report contains information which should be of interest to members of this House. As you are aware, the Film Classification Board replaced the former Manitoba Film Censor Board as of last October 16th. The transition to the new Classification Board which was enlarged to 15 members under the Chairmanship of Father John J. Pungente has been effected smoothly and the Board wishes to acknowledge the co-operation that it has received from the Manitoba Film Distributors and Exhibitors and from the Winnipeg daily newspapers which publish capsule comments of film appearing in Winnipeg theatres as prepared by the Board's chairman as a guidance to moviegoers.

The Board also sends to all licensed distributors and exhibitors in the province, a monthly report of films viewed, their classification and a descriptive sentence as to the nature of each film. The Board's report includes some interesting statistics on films viewed during the 1972 calendar year. Of 412 first . . . feature length films viewed the classifications were as follows: General 71, Mature 179; Adult Parental Guidance 142; and Restricted Adult 20. It should be noted that the Restricted Adult category barring admission to a person under full age of 18 did not come into effect until October 16th. Had it been in effect for the full year, more of the films in the Adult Parental Guidance category would have been classified as Restricted Adult. The Board also notes that more films in the General Mature category are being shown in Winnipeg and that some of these are having long and successful runs in contrast to the so-called skin flicks and pornographic type of films which have short runs with many empty seats. The Board hopes that this is a trend that will continue.

If I may summarize other highlights of the report, they are briefly as follows:

(1) No complaints have been received in the past year regarding newspaper advertising of films.

(2) There have been complaints from time to time about too much violence or too explicit sex content in TV commercials for movies. The Board is studying this complex problem to determine how its powers can be used to effect a change.

(3) Theatre inspection maintained on a regular basis in the Winnipeg area will be stepped up in the new fiscal year in an attempt to cover all theatres in the province at least twice.

(4) Although occasional reports of under-age persons being admitted to restricted films are of major concern to the inspectors, inspections to date have not found such violation. The Board believes the majority of film exhibitors are conscientiously trying to abide by the laws of the Amusement Act. Theatres showing restricted films are being checked to the extent possible.

I might say that I had a couple of complaints myself. The name of -- (Interjection) -- The name of the classification was too small and I insist that they have larger, and then somebody was playing with the -- (Interjection) -- Well for God's sake, get up and give your point!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. First item is bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, speaking strictly to the amendment of this bill giving it a six months hoist, which basically says that the bill will be discussed six months hence and which basically kills the bill. Yet we hear from the government side that they are in favour of the election of mayor by the people of Winnipeg, so why would we get a six months hoist if, as the Minister of Urban Affairs says, there is something coming in that will make changes to the bill generally that will include the change or amendment to the bill that would have the mayor elected? It's hard to understand if it's going to happen this session why we would have an amendment to this bill that gives it a six months hoist.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding, as I've said, it leaves me cold quite frankly and it must leave members of this House, elected members of this House cold that the Premier and members of the government would say that they are in favour of it and then give it this hoist, and so basically what we are saying in a very petty childish way is, "I am not going to allow a member of this House to make this change to the bill or amend the bill, it has to be me."

Now why it has to be the government I will never know, whether they have the feeling that if somebody else does this, puts in this amendment, that it would be harmful to the government. Again, I don't understand why it would be harmful. All they have to do is get up and vote for the amendment or the bill as put in, rather than amend it, and we have the job done. We have it done in no uncertain terms.

Here we have a situation of "I did it my way" coming up which is to me absolute disrespect, as far as I'm concerned, to a member of this House or all other members of this House who put in a private members' bill saying that this should be done. But no, we get a six months hoist from the government and the government side is saying that we agree with it. And with the lame duck excuse that there are other changes coming through and we want to put them all together. Now it doesn't really, it doesn't really make that much sense. This bill is printed, it's here, it's available to be voted on, and so now we have the feeling of suspicion, you know; all of a sudden we have everybody saying that they want it and all of a sudden we've got a bill in front of us that says it can't be done and all of a sudden the government wants to be very petty about the whole thing and have a disregard for anybody else putting in a bill because they want to do it. And the suspicious part about it, Mr. Speaker, as I understand — and I understand this because I don't usually attend NDP conventions and it is a pity, it is a pity, as the Honourable Member from St. Johns says, because maybe I could change some of the renegades around there, but when I get talking common sense to them, but from that point of view, that's the only reason I would attend.

Mr. Speaker, the convention in 1971 passed a resolution, I am told, with about a 70 percent vote that the City of Winnipeg Act not be changed — not be changed — which means possibly the NDP Party, and if that is true, if that resolution passed on that majority, we are in a situation of the government here saying, "Well we won't we won't just pass this right now, we'll give it a six months hoist" and how do you have a government go against the party? So there's your basic reason for suspicion. The government is obviously very concerned that the NDP Party generally, generally do not want to see the Winnipeg Act changed. And it's surprising that when they say, "Give it a six months hoist," you know, why?

The other suspicious part, Mr. Speaker, is for four years I have seen this government say, oh, we'll talk about it, or we'll do something, and they throw something into the boon docks, they bury different issues on the basis of discussion, and all of a sudden we see that it doesn't happen the way that they have said. So really the six months hoist gives people the real reason to be very very leary of the fact that the government has said that they are going

## BILL 21

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . to have the mayor elected. And they're going to do it on the basis of change of the Winnipeg Act. They're talking about changes in structure of the Winnipeg Act. And now if we have some changes in structure maybe they have another form or another way of saying how the mayor should be elected in the City of Winnipeg. And if they are changing this structure, maybe, maybe we've got a group of people again who have been brought in to discuss and figure out a way that they can avoid, that the government can avoid having the mayor elected because the NDP Party doesn't really generally want the mayor elected. And suspicion, yes. I must say that the First Minister at times to me has said that he would do nothing, he would do nothing with Autopac, he wouldn't put in Autopac until he had great discussions with the industry. And to my knowledge, my knowledge, Sir, this discussion has never taken place.

We have a situation of suspicion when the government wants to play around, and play around is right because the bill is there before us. Make all the changes to the Winnipeg Act that you want, that you want, but just leave this out. You've got a bill printed before you that makes this change that everybody is agreeable to apparently in this House from the government side, but yet, yet we can't seem to have this bill passed. We get an obstructionist type of situation from the government, a six months hoist which means it's dead. Which is dead. If you bring in some amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act and you're going to say that the mayor is going to be elected at large, why then, why then you're obviously -- it's against the amendment that I just see before me. You know, you give it a six months hoist and maybe three weeks later you make a change. Well that's the -- that's the reason for doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this would happen.

Mr. Speaker, again I have been corrected, Sir, and I don't whether rightly or wrongly so, but I take the members in this House at their word and my statement was that in all other areas mayors are elected and the Honourable Member from St. Vital in conversation -- and again, I don't like to bring up conversation outside the House but I don't think it's harmful. He corrected me by saying that that is not the case; the mayor is not elected in all areas, and he brought up the areas, some areas in Europe where the mayor may be appointed or something of that nature. But to my knowledge in Canada, in Canada, in most places in Canada anyway, the mayor is the elected representative of the people and he is elected by the people and I don't know that we want to see that changed at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, so why? There's really an explanation required. The explanation we got from the Minister of Urban Affairs giving this six months hoist is a shallow nothing explanation. We need to have an explanation why the government says that they agree to having the mayor elected in the City of Winnipeg and yet will not vote for this bill and in fact gives it the six months hoist and buries it. I think that's a valid explanation and to say that, to say that, you know, we are going to bring it in in changes and we are going to bring it in in amendments, is basically saying that a member in this House is wasting his time by bringing in amendments because we don't want you to do it, we want to be the Big Brothers and we want to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, changes in structure you can have. In fact I would be very happy if you completely, if you completely change the structure of the mess that you created in the City of Winnipeg. I'd be only too happy that you really go to work and change that lousy mess that we've got in the City of Winnipeg at the present time. But you have in front of you a bill that says the mayor will be elected. So why don't we vote for it? Why do we get a six months hoist? Why do we have this halo of doubt, the halo of doubt standing over the City of Winnipeg? The halo of doubt is that the Premier has said, "Yes, I agree with it and it will be done;" and yet he and his party on the other side are going to stand up and vote for a six months hoist. Now halo, shadow, whatever way you want to put it, you know, if I don't -- if I want to gay halo of doubt, because that's the only halo those fellows have over their is a doubtful one. So we just leave it particularly in that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government has to make an explanation of why they would bring in an amendment maybe two or three weeks from now, or tomorrow in fact, and at the same time give this bill a six months hoist. Mr. Speaker, the discussion, all we ever seem to get is "we want to discuss it" from this government, and discussion from this government really nobody gets anywhere with it. It's just a little bit of nonsense. We hear the Kierans' Report, we hear all of these other reports, the Guidelines, and there they are, they're

## BILL 21

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . there for discussion. And after we have discussion, after we have discussion we find out that, by God, it didn't happen. The only way — pardon me, we find out what happens is this, that the government does it their way anyway after all the discussion. So that's why we have this halo. That's why we have this cloud, if the Minister wants me to call it a cloud.

The people of Winnipeg know at the present time that there is a bill in the Legislature that says the mayor of Winnipeg he will be elected at large by the citizens of Winnipeg, and all of a sudden it's not happening. And we don't know why. You know, why? That's a simple explanation that we should have. If the Minister, the First Minister wants to get up and say, "I agree with it," if he wants to say that oh, I'd like to do it my way, I'll give him that if he wants to do it his way, but it's very childish because the bill's here. And if he wants to do it that way, fine, but you know why, while this bill is here, the people of Winnipeg know it's here, is it not being passed?

MR. DOERN: You'll find out.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker -- oh yes, the Member from, the Minister of Public Works says, you'll find out, and I really have to disregard anything he says because in this House he has shown that he is completely, completely against anything that the Mayor of Winnipeg may or may not do. He believes that, he believes that the Mayor, because the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg stood up and defended the people of Winnipeg which is his job, and does so because he's the elected member of the people, that he thinks that he shouldn't do that. Why would the Mayor of Winnipeg stand up and fight anybody, especially me, especially the big Member of Public Works, you know? This great big man with the loaded shoes who can hardly shuffle around wonders why the Mayor of Winnipeg would be completely against him. Well, the Mayor of Winnipeg was defending the people of Winnipeg, and that's what an elected Mayor does. He is there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members on the other side, the same as my colleague from Lakeside is saying, why? Why? Why don't you pass this bill? Why give it a six-months hoist? Why not tell the people that every member of this House has the right to put a Private Members' Bill in. Are you afraid that they'll say that somebody thought of it before you did? You know -- so really, isn't it petty? Isn't it petty? That here we have the bill; we could have, rather than have a six months hoist, we could have passed it three weeks ago. The people of Winnipeg would know their Mayor is going to be elected. But no, the halo and shadow of doubt in this government. And why? Why? Because we know damn well that it doesn't always happen the way this government says. Discussions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . discussions. So, Mr. Speaker, we need an explanation on that side of the House. Thank you very much.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

## BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am quite disappointed in the submission of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek because he is one of the more prominent members of the Progressive Conservative Party, a would-be leadership candidate, and one of a small handful of members of that Party who were elected in the City of Winnipeg, and I think that if we get the calibre of comments on Urban Affairs as exhibited by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, then I can only predict that in the next election there'll be fewer yet from that side of the House because his speech consisted of great repetition simply asking why wasn't it done now, repeating that ad nauseum. And I for one will attempt to at least answer part of the problem that he poses as to why this question shouldn't be dealt with at this time, but that more consideration should in fact be given to it.

When the honourable member thinks that this is such a good idea, I ask him to consider the source; of all the men in this House who might qualify as someone with urban background or urban expertise, I can think of no-one who qualifies less than the Member for Rupertsland, because if anybody has no background in urban matters and no comprehension of urban affairs, it is him. And I can only wonder there, along with my friend, as to why he introduced this bill, and why he is so interested in bringing in this particular change in the affairs of the City of Winnipeg.

I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Rupertsland is looking for a seat, because I think it is generally known that it is not possible for him to run in his own riding, to win a nomination or to win an election, and the same goes for his bench mate, the Member for Thompson. Both of these gentlemen are looking around, giant killers both, looking for some weakness in the NDP armour; willing to take on any Cabinet Minister so that they can, they can annihilate them on their own home ground. Well, we know, Mr. Speaker, that that is a fallacy, that what they are doing is scrambling for their life. They are running around like a chicken with their head cut off; running around looking for a place in which to put their name forward in nomination. Well, there's only one rooster that I am aware of in this particular House -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland throws down his tremendous number of submissions of these coupons which were clipped out of the paper, some 4,000 in total, and he wishes to build a case for an overwhelming consensus of support for a change in regard to the status of the election of the Mayor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, out of 540,000 people, if this is supposed to be an overwhelming consensus of opinion, then I think that that case still in fact has to be made; because the story has not been told, the story has only been told in terms of one portion of the entire government process of the City of Winnipeg, and that is in relation to the election of the Mayor of Winnipeg; that leaves the Council; it leaves the duties and functions of the individual councillor; it leaves out the question of the community committees; it leaves out the questions of the standing committees; it leaves out comparisons with other jurisdictions, avoids many questions. I compare the question asked by the Member for Rupertsland, would you like an elected mayor, to an answer to a question, would you like lower taxes? The answer is "yes", "no", or "not sure". So if you have to think in terms of a question like that, if it isn't obvious that the answer to that question is yes, then I really fail to comprehend what the average person would do, because the alternative, the alternative is not explained, and obviously if someone says, would you like to vote for the Premier or wouldn't you, the answer is of course "yes". Would you like lower taxes? The answer is "yes". Would you like to vote for an elected mayor? The answer is "yes", because the alternative has never been put.

The alternative of course is very simple. The alternative -- (Interjections) -- is a system, analogous to that which we have in this Legislature and in the Federal House of Commons, namely that the leadership for the Council comes from the Council. The average citizen does not in a direct sense vote for the Premier, does not in a direct sense vote for the Prime Minister; he votes for a member in his riding; he votes for a political Party, and in a sense he does in fact become influenced and votes for a leader, but he does that only indirectly by casting a ballot in his own individual riding.

So I think -- (Interjection) -- yes I think that Party politics and civic government is in fact the best form. Now if we can't have that, if it is somehow or other repulsive or repugnant to the citizens, or if the citizens are misled and believe that the people that represent them

## BILL 21

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . come from some non-partisan thing, that politics is a very dirty game like we play in this Chamber every day, it's a terrible thing, the British Parliamentary system, the democratic process, if we cannot have this in the City of Winnipeg, tsk tsk tsk, then we must have a non-political system, we must have no political parties, the group for good government, the ICEC, and all these other fabrications that are thought up by the Member for Riel and other people who go around trying to conceive of new names and new initials and new bushes to hide behind, so that anything is possible but to admit that one is a Liberal or a Conservative. We mustn't have any of that here, we must come into a new coalition; we must be above all this petty partisan politics sort of stuff.

So when it comes to polls, Mr. Chairman, polls can give you a reasonable indication of what's going on. But I submit that the coupon clippings of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland don't amount to a hill of beans. I've seen how some of these petitions work. I have debated with some of the councillors about this tremendous response to this great international incident of the washroom debate and how councillors received the petition of a 1,000 names and then were coerced and inspired to respond to that petition, how they were responding to public opinion. What was left out of course was that one Councillor Coopman went running around to all the Legions one Saturday night, picked up a few hundred names, threw them down, looked at them and then said, good heavens there's public reaction here, public response, now I must respond to these signatures that I have collected. That's the kind of activity we have seen, and then we've seen more recent evidences of course of some polls that have been taken. President Nixon's poll of course where they had a phone-in poll on the Vietnam war -- (Interjection) -- several thousand supporting the President, a thousand or two against, and then one of the Republicans happened to mention that, oh, gee, well, you know, we knew the Democrats would be mailing in some of these ballots, so we mailed in 2,000 in ourselves to counter the possibility that they might be stacking the deck against us.

Mr. Speaker, pardon me. The original proposal, the original proposal it was for a kind of mini-legislature. I believe that in fact if you look at the original proposal as it was made by us, that it did in fact put forward a kind of mini-legislature; it did in fact I think recognize that political parties have a role to play in Canadian society and in the affairs of a municipality, and I think that it did in fact call for a powerful mayor, a more powerful mayor than will ever be elected by the kind of process put forward by the Member for Rupertsland, because who has more power, a mayor who is elected by the people who sit in the council, some 50 strong, give him their support; he is their leader; they work under his direction; he determines the kind of policy; or a mayor who is popularly elected, who sits in many instances in opposition to the views of his own council, and who can often be in conflict to his own council. I submit that the more powerful mayor was in fact the kind originally conceived in the legislation as it was drawn in the original bill which is now going to in fact be amended. -- (Interjection) --

Well, my honourable colleague - I'm not sure whose he's expressly referring to -- (Interjection) -- the mayors. Well, I don't know whether this kind of government is any good or not. I know that when my leader gives his opinion he speaks for the government. I know that our policies are hammered out in caucus and in Cabinet. But I don't know whether this kind of government is all that good. I know that the Mayor of Winnipeg when commenting on a recent scolding he received from the Executive Policy Committee in relation to the Provincial Government's offer of \$2 million, they weren't very happy with the kind of presentation he made, and they criticized him for it -- his comment was, "they can just go to hell". Well I have never heard, Mr. Speaker, a Premier, or a Prime Minister, refer to his colleagues in the front bench or in the backbench in those terms, but if you buy a split system of an elected mayor and then a separate elected council, that is what you buy. You buy the conflict and the clash between the two of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the reason the government does not accept that amendment at this time, the amendment put forward by the Member for Rupertsland, is that if we change the election of the mayor so that it becomes by direct ballot by the public, then we have a hybrid system and it is necessary to then, since we are going to make a fundamental change in the system, to re-examine the entire system and determine where other changes can and should be made. I think that one of the most obvious changes that will have to be considered is the size of the council, and I have my own opinion on this. I have spoken to a few councillors to sound them out and I would submit that it will be overwhelmingly popular to reduce the size of council,

## BILL 21

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . to cut that council from 50 seats down somewhere between say 18 and 24. They're now talking about six major -- (Interjections) -- six major wards -- I am proposing it for consideration, yes. I believe this is one of the things that the government will have to consider, and so if there are going to be six major districts or six major wards, I think it would be logical, Mr. Speaker, to have either three or four councillors from each ward, so that you would have a council of the order of 18 to 24. Why? Because when you tamper with the system in a fundamental way, then it becomes unmanageable. If you have 50 councillors and a mayor who comes from that group, it is manageable, as manageable as this Legislature or as the House of Commons. But once you start changing the system then the 50 councillors, their relationship to the mayor, their relationship to their functions, certain problems ensue.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the Councils across the country where they have elected mayors, and so on, you can see that when you go for that kind of system you tend to go for a system of 10 to 20 councillors, which is the kind of council in Vancouver, in Toronto, in Calgary, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that another area that some consideration should be given to, and I am now putting my own views on to the floor of the House, but I think these are the kind of questions that should be thought through. I think a full-time chairman of Council should be a consideration, somebody who is probably elected from his own group who would have a better salary, a full-time position. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, the more full-time people in politics the better -- naturally there are limits, you're talking of a couple of dozen municipal people. I think as far as I'm concerned the more people who are full-time the better because they are only a handful in comparison to the people they represent, and a handful in comparison to the public servants that they should in fact be directing.

We will obviously have to consider other factors as to whether we want people representing the kind of wards that they represent now; whether they should just be larger wards or whether we should look to the kind of ward that the Metropolitan Council had, a sort of pie shaped ward which cut across various constituency boundaries.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think there are other possibilities. There might be a need for some more full-time research people who might provide assistance in particular to, directly to the Board of Commissioners or other committees that are not directly beneath them as part of the normal civil service or line departments but people who are attached to some of the policy-making committees directly. I think, as I've said, that we have to examine the structure of the Standing Committees and the success or weaknesses of some of the community committees.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at all of these factors which I have represented -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's relevant whether the Member for Rupertsland is here or not. As I have said, I dismiss categorically his knowledge of urban affairs and he can dismiss my knowledge of certain northern affairs and I will not object to that, but I say that he is out of his field here and he knows it and we know it.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to consider some of these factors that I have mentioned, I think that this will require a great deal of discussion and debate. I think that there will be, there will be some debate in this Chamber. I think there should be an input from the members of council themselves and I think also on the part of the public. So there is no way that it makes sense to make such a fundamental change as the election of the mayor without considering all of these other factors.

I would just say in conclusion that when it comes to urban problems I think that the interest of the MLAs, and particularly my own colleagues in the front bench and the back bench, our interest in the future of the City of Winnipeg and its progress and the welfare of its people at least is great, if not greater, than the councillors we have a right to express ourselves on the fundamental issues concerning the future of the City and its people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Minister of Public Works speak, certainly I would like to make a few comments and I think refute some of the things that were said.

In my opinion, after hearing him I come to the opinion that they have already in mind of bringing in an omnibus bill the next time around if they're still on that side the next time round. We know what the Federal Government did, what Mr. Trudeau did. He brought in a bill with so many bad things when he brought in an omnibus bill at one time, but at the same

## BILL 21

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . time he brought in a few goodies in it and in order to get those things they had to vote for all the bad things as well. And I rather suspect that this is exactly what these people are intending to do when they do not accept this bill of changing to elect the mayor at large from the present legislation.

Certainly from what the Minister of Public Works has stated, he is against it already, and I'm just wondering how many more there are in that group that are against having the mayor elected at large even though the Premier has indicated that he is for it. -- (Interjection) -- I rather suspect that there are a large number in there that do not subscribe to the idea and to the principle of having the mayor elected at large, and this is one of the reasons why they will not accept the amendment at this time. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I would certainly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FROESE: . . . tell the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that Social Credit and their caucus decided that they would support the mayor elected at large. (applause) -- (Interjection) -- After all, all the rural reeves and the mayors are elected at large. This is simply in accord with what we have on the statutes already in the Municipal Act, and now we are going to differentiate from that. The City of Winnipeg is not to follow the same lines that have been established in the Municipal Act. Why the change? Why do you feel that the smaller, the rural towns or even cities like Brandon and so on and the municipalities shall elect the reeve and the mayor at large, yet when it comes to the City of Winnipeg you say, no dice. Why? Why the inconsistency? Let's hear the real reasons why you object to having the mayor elected at large.

Certainly it seems to me that when you have the members of council elected by the different wards that if the mayor had first to be elected in a given ward and then was selected as a leader, that he would still have to cater to the needs of his local area in order to get elected in the first place, and as a result, he might not give the same consideration in being a statesman and looking after the people as a whole. Certainly we have seen this happen so often, that members will come out on a certain issue, a certain way, because their people in their own constituency feel very strongly about a certain point. But the members in convention or the people in their convention of their own party had gone a different way and had given a dictate to them. But they ignored that dictate and went according to what their own people told them what to do and how to act. So you override the decisions of the convention and this is exactly what is going to happen here if you follow the line that you intend to take.

I still feel that if this is not accepted at this time that there will be an omnibus bill with a lot of other amendments that we on this side might find ourselves take objection to, and yet we would not like to see this part defeated. And therefore, members on this side of the House, if the situation remains as it is, will have to vote for something that they do not want or object to by having this matter dealt with in such a way that they would like to see the mayor elected at large.

Then who knows, certainly they're already thinking of different amendments that they may strip the mayor of a lot of his powers that he presently has. The Minister of Public Works already mentioned that there should be a separate chairman of committee, and what other things do they have in mind of stripping the mayor's powers? And I think this is what the mayor, the present mayor is suspecting, that there will be powers cut from his office and his position. The members back of me say that that is why he intends to run in Elmwood. I haven't heard -- (Interjection) -- that this is actually the case although there was mention made in the past to that effect. I rather suspect that he could probably run in any of the Greater Winnipeg constituencies and win this election, so that some seats might certainly change in the next election.

I took very strong exception to a press report in the Winnipeg Free Press where the Minister of Education, according to that report, had made the statement that there was no purpose in a private member bringing in a bill because they would automatically be defeated or short shifted. And I take very strong exception to that because that certainly, if that were to happen as a matter of policy, then you're destroying parliament. You're destroying this Legislature. You're destroying our total system and you're destroying democracy, if that is a foregone conclusion that any private members' bill will automatically be voted down or given a hoist so that it will not be allowed to pass, and that you will no longer consider legislation on its merits, I think this is a very sorry state of affairs when it has to come down to that level, that legislation brought in by members on all sides of the House should receive fair consideration and be dealt with on that basis.

## BILL 21

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

The Minister of Public Works mentioned leadership candidate when he spoke about the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I just wonder, has he ambitions in challenging his leader that he might want to lead the New Democratic Party in some future time, probably immediately after the next election? Certainly if he has that ambition I'd be interested in knowing because -- (Interjection) -- it would certainly be of interest to members on this side to know that.

The matter of electing the mayor at large certainly has been acceptable by the people of Manitoba or by the people - more so by the people of Winnipeg, because I feel that the mayor received a very thorough endorsement at the last election here in Greater Winnipeg, in Unicity, and I see no reason why not, why to change it now or leaving the legislation as it is now so that he can no longer be elected at large. Certainly I would like to see some better reasons being put forward by this government than they have to date as they refuse the bill to allow - and allow it to pass at this time. Certainly no logical solid arguments have been advanced and I would like to see that they support the bill rather than to give it the six months hoist.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have enjoyed the rather acrimonious debate at times but at least a thorough airing of the question this year. Last year I proposed the same sort of an amendment and, as I recall and I can be corrected, but day after day the Member for Radisson, affectionately known by the Member for Thompson as pork chop, day after day would stand the debate on the bill. And of course there was a government plan; it was the plan to scuttle the bill by not having debate on it. And so therefore it died on the Order Paper.

But I listened with interest tonight to the Minister of Public Works and he spent about, oh, I would say ten minutes of his speech attacking two members in the Legislature who in his opinion had no right to talk about urban affairs in the City of Winnipeg. -- (Interjection) -- He spent a great deal of time running down the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Thompson as if it was none of their business whatsoever. Well, Mr. Speaker, surely in this House all 56 members, yourself excluded, are equal in this House and have the right to talk on any question whatsoever that comes before the House. Are we now, if we take the dictate of the Minister of Public Works, that because someone is from a rural area or a northern area they have no right to enter into debate on urban affairs in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works state his matter of privilege.

MR. DOERN: I would like to make it very clear that I did not say what the Member for Portage is indicating. I believe that every member has a right to speak on any issue but I did argue that some are better qualified than others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting admission. Now only certain people who in the opinion of the Minister of Public Works, who is better qualified, should only be speaking and no one else. Is that the understanding? -- (Interjection) -- Well the Minister of Public Works is speaking from his seat and he said I am demonstrating that right now. And I say, right now, that every member in this House has the right to speak, criticize, praise, move amendments, do what they wish on any bill. -- (Interjection) --

You know, it's rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works who is the Member for Elmwood, finds himself in a bind with the Mayor of Winnipeg by, well, I shouldn't say talking too much on a question but certainly his actions on handling matters which should be really purely administrative within the department, and I speak now of his problems with his biffy, that he is now in a personal feud with the Mayor of Winnipeg and he's losing, in my opinion he's losing no opportunity to downgrade the Mayor of Winnipeg in any way in which he can. --(Interjection)-- You're right. You're right. He did it to himself and I agree with you. I agree with you.

The Member for Radisson who is not in his seat, said, and I hope it'll appear on the record, that the Minister of Public Works has done it to himself by his speeches. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Member for Radisson is great at speaking from his seat. If he's in his seat, that is. Mostly he's in someone else's seat. But now that he's in his seat if he wishes to correct me I stand for the correction, if he wishes to correct me. But I understood him to say that the Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works, has done a pretty good job of putting his foot in his mouth. -- (Interjection) --

## BILL 21

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did make a comment from my seat. I wasn't able to sit in my seat at the time. However, the comment was that the mayor and not the Member for Elmwood actually couldn't do any more damage than he did himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order. The honourable member should not speak from his seat. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . appreciate your ruling that the Member for Radisson when he scuttled back to his seat certainly had no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Surely, if the Member for Johnston attributed - (laughter) - the Member for Portage la Prairie said that the Member for Radisson said something from his seat which the Member for Radisson did not say, said it on the record, the Member for Radisson has the right to get up and say that he didn't say it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I can accept whatever is said in this House but let me indicate that matters that are explanations are not necessarily points of order. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling once again. I might say before I get into my remarks again that I appreciate the compliment that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources gave to me when he said "the Member for Johnston". I represent a historic constituency called Portage la Prairie. I don't know of any movement to rename the constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is going to make something out of the fact that I slipped and used his name rather than the Member for Portage la Prairie. If he wants me to get down on my hands and knees and beg him to forgive me for having made that slip of the tongue and to prostrate myself before him, I will do so.

A MEMBER: No you won't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compliment that the Minister of Mines has paid me and I certainly would not like to see him prostrate in this Chamber.

But to return to my remarks seriously, Mr. Speaker, I'm rather surprised that the NDP convention, I believe it was last August, voted against the proposition to have the Mayor of Greater Winnipeg elected by a popular vote, and it really surprises me when the heat was on a few days, or a few weeks ago, via the by-lines, and via the newspapers, and via the speeches of the Member for Rupertsland, that the Premier in a very indignant and heated manner said, "Well look, we're going to do this but do it in our own time." So, -- (Interjection) -- you know, you'll pardon us, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House if we're a bit confused.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable Minister of Mines on a question of . . .

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member accept from me the suggestion that the New Democratic Party convention passed no such resolution.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, that's what I said, Mr. Speaker, I said the NDP voted against it and I certainly agree that it wasn't passed at their convention.

MR. GREEN: . . . to ask the honourable member to accept from me that the proceeding that he is talking about was not a New Democratic Party convention, it was a conference of municipal people campaigning to get elected to the City Council.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Oh yes, I accept the statement. I wonder if there are NDP people trying to get elected, I don't know, but I accept that statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've had the strange situation tonight where a Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Public Works has stood up and in between his statements, which I thought was policy, he said, no, these are my own views, these are my own views, they're not the views of my Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree that people on matters of conscience should be able to take this sort of a stand, but surely on a technical, political question, when a Minister stands in his place and says, well these are only my views, they're not the views of my Party, then really those of us on this side have cause to wonder where the NDP Party stands on this question. We have had the Premier in a press release, and also in a statement in this House, to say, well he agrees with the motion, or the amendment to the City of Winnipeg bill, to have the mayor elected by popular vote. But Mr. Speaker, I wonder, I wonder if they're hoping Mr. Juba will

BILL 21

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . retire, or go away, or be quiet -- which he never will be, he never will be -- or some other method of him leaving the political scene in Winnipeg.

So perhaps I could be justifiably concerned when the Premier says they are going to do this, but in their own good time. Last year they scuttled the bill by allowing it to be dropped off the Order Paper. The Party Whip in the NDP held it in adjournment for weeks on end and I believe, if my memory serves me correctly -- (Interjections) -- and despite what the Minister of Public Works has said that the Member for Rupertsland is grandstanding, if that's the word, or if he has no right to introduce this sort of an amendment to a bill, and is not capable, and so on, to speak on Urban Affairs, I really wonder what the NDP Party stand is on this. I would like to hear from some of the backbenchers who I know have very strong views on this matter, yet they're hoping perhaps that the bill will go away. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose an amendment, it will take me about 30 seconds . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)